



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/809,009 | 03/16/2001 | Jean-Marc Ascione | 05725.0634-00 | 5103 |

22852 7590 11/01/2002

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ELHILO, EISA B

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1751

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/809,009

Applicant(s)

ASCIONE ET AL.

Examiner

Eisa B Elhilo

Art Unit

1751

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-65.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1751

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant has not presented any additional data or showing to overcome the rejection of record. Further, the applicant argues that the Examiner has previously admitted that (US' 295) does not teach or suggest anionic associative polymer comprising at least one carboxylic acid and at least one ester derived from an alkoxylated fatty alcohol and a carboxylic acid.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. The position of the Examiner is clearly stated in the Office action dated January 24, 2002 that (US' 295) teaches and discloses anionic amphiphilic polymers containing at least one hydrophilic unit of unsaturated olefinic carboxylic acid and at least one hydrophobic unit which is a C10-C30 alkyl ester of unsaturated carboxylic selected from those hydrophilic unit of unsaturated olefinic carboxylic acid (see page 2, of the Office Action dated January 24, 2002). Further, the examiner clearly stated that (US' 295) does not teach or disclose dyeing ingredients such as anionic associative polymer as additional polymer which is crosslinked with allyl ether as claimed in claim 27 (see page 3, of the Office action dated January 24, 2002) and this deficiency is cured by the secondary reference US' 195. Therefore, the combined references do teach and disclose similar ingredients that used in the hair dyeing composition and also the references disclose all the limitations of the claimed invention and, hence, the prima facie case of obviousness has been established. Examiner has never admitted on record that US' 295 does not teach or suggest anionic associative polymer comprising at least carboxylic acid and at least one ester derived from an alkoxylated alcohol and a carboxylic acid.


Mark Kopec
Primary Examiner